

Application No.: 10/731,371
Reply to Office Action dated: July 29, 2008
Reply dated: October 28, 2008

a migrating utility that takes the user security information from each of the plurality of first type servers and update the security data repository,

wherein, in response to receiving a request for authentication from a client at any one of said plurality of first type servers, the system initiates an LDAP session between said one of said plurality of first type servers and said second type server, passes query information from said LDAP authentication server to said embedded LDAP server, receives corresponding user security information, and creates a token that reflects an authentication result that can be used by said client.

Remarks

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed July 29, 2008. A fee for one additional claim is enclosed with this communication. Prior to the Office Action mailed July 29, 2008, Claims 1-49 were pending in the Application. The present Response amends Claims 1, 3-5, 13, 16-18, 26, 28-30, 38, and 40-42; and adds new Claim 50, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-50. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written requirement.

Applicant respectfully submits that dependent Claims 3-4, 16-18, 28-30, and 40-42 have all been amended. In addition, Paragraph [0021], Lines 10-11 of the current Specification indicates that the Tuxedo server uses the tpgrp file to hold the group information. Hence, independent Claims 1, 13, 26, and 38 is supported.

In view of the statement above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-49 have been amended to satisfy the requirement under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action mailed August 28, 2007, Claim 1-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0033535.

Claim 1

Claim 1, as previously amended, defines the feature of “*a plurality of first type servers, wherein each of the plurality of first type servers holds group information and access control list and includes an LDAP authentication server,*” and “*a second type server that includes an embedded LDAP server.*”

As shown in the Abstract and **Figure 1**, Fisher describes a system with only one CAP sever and potentially multiple backend servers. As stated in the Office Action, the CAP server is

interpreted as the first type server which handles a request from a client, or the enterprise server, and the backend server is interpreted as the second type server.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Fisher does not teach the feature of using a plurality of first type servers along with one second type server.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 13, 26, and 38

Claims 13, 26, and 38, while independently patentable, recite limitations that similarly to Claim 1 are not disclosed nor rendered obvious by the cited references. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-12, 14-25, 27-37 and 39-49

Claims 2-12, 14-25, 27-37 and 39-49 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

Claim 50

Claim 50 defines the feature of "*a migrating utility that takes the user security information from each of the plurality of first type servers and update the security data repository.*"

Applicant respectfully submits that Fisher and other cited arts do not teach this feature.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 50, as submitted, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Application No.: 10/731,371
Reply to Office Action dated: July 29, 2008
Reply dated: October 28, 2008

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Applicant believes that no fee is due with this communication. However, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 28, 2008

By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/

Kuiran (Ted) Liu
Reg. No. 60,039

Customer No.: 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800